

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamei et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,274,516). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Kamei discloses a display apparatus comprising an inorganic SOG film that has been surfaced treated by a irradiating the film with ultraviolet (UV) light or plasma, and then coated with a second SOG film to reduce unevenness and flatten the film. The Examiner further alleges that the second SOG film reads on the claimed functional film because it has the function of reducing unevenness and flattening the film. By irradiating the inorganic SOG film with UV or plasma, the wettability of the inorganic SOG film with respect to the second SOG film is increased. Because the wettability of the inorganic SOG film is increased, the inorganic SOG film allegedly reads on the claimed lyophilic film. Notwithstanding, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the lyophilic film is formed of a lyophilic material. This amendment is supported at, for example, page 10, paragraph [0053], where it states that the lyophilic film 16 is also formed by a lyophilic material. Kamei fails to disclose such a structure.

More specifically, as stated above, Kamei increases the wettability of the inorganic SOG film by irradiating the film with UV light or with plasma. Because Kamei

irradiates the surface of the inorganic SOG film to make it more wettable, however, Kamei fails to disclose a structure wherein lyophilic film formed of a lyophilic material is used. That is, because Kamei fails to disclose a lyophilic film formed of a lyophilic material, but rather teaches an inorganic SOG film that must be irradiated with plasma or UV light to become more wettable, Kamei fails to anticipate a device comprising a lyophilic film that is actually formed of a lyophilic material, as claimed.

With respect to claim 5, this claim has also been amended and rewritten. Claim 5 now recites that the lyophilic film is deposited on the base component. Kamei also fails to disclose such a method.

More specifically, Kamei merely discloses that a film with increased wettability is formed by irradiating an inorganic SOG layer with either UV light or plasma. In contrast, as claimed, the present invention recites a method of depositing a lyophilic film on the base component. That is, the lyophilic film is already lyophilic in nature and does not need to be “formed” like the method disclosed in Kamei. Because Kamei fails to disclose a method wherein a film that is already lyophilic in nature is deposited on the base component, Kamei fails to disclose each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Kamei, therefore, does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claim 11 has been added. New claim 11 recites that the lyophilic material is a hydrocarbon polymerized film. This subject matter is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Kamei. More specifically, Kamei teaches materials that are inorganic in nature. In


contrast, a hydrocarbon polymerized film is organic in nature. Because Kamei teaches films that are inorganic versus organic, as claimed, claim 11 is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Kamei.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 21, 2005

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/JAH